UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,663	12/01/2003	Radoslav Danilak	NVID-P001159	5113

7590   01/25/2007
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
LEE, CHUN KUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2181	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,6-8,12 and 13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *2-5, 9-11 and 14-20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,6-8,12 and 13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

<u>RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS</u>

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Currently, claims 2-5

and 9-11 and 14-20 are withdrawn and claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 are pending for

examination.

2.   In responding to applicant's arguments that <u>Chisholm</u> does not teach or suggest

the claimed limitation of "disk drive," because the disk drive mentioned by <u>Chisholm</u> is

not an ATA disk drive, instead, it is an SCSI disk drive, as stated on page 8, 2nd

paragraph to page 9, 2nd paragraph. Applicant's arguments have fully been considered,

but are not found to be persuasive.

        Please note that the features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features

upon which applicant relies (i.e., wherein the disk drive is an ATA disk drive) are not

recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re

Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, as stated

in the applicant's remark, <u>Chisholm</u> does teach the disk drive operating in accordance to

the SCSI standard (Remarks, page 9, 2nd paragraph).

3.   In responding to applicant's arguments that <u>Chisholm</u> does not teach or suggest

the claimed limitation of "bypass register," because the "bypass register" is defined in

the specification as being, <u>for example</u>, a register that "... bypass the prior art ATA step

of writing to a set of 8 bit registers in the disk controller to implement a disk transaction,"

as stated on page 8, 2nd paragraph to page 9, 2nd paragraph and page 10, 2nd

paragraph. Applicant's arguments have fully been considered, but are not found to be

persuasive.

It appears that the specification does not expressly state that the "bypass register

is defined as the register that bypass the prior art ATA step of writing to a set of 8 bit

registers in the disk controller to implement a disk transaction," but instead, and in

combination to the applicant's remarks as stated above, the term "bypass" is an

embodiment and how the "bypass register" is utilized is an example. Furthermore,

<u>Chisholm</u>'s register (Fig. 3, ref. 311) and local memory (<u>Chisholm</u>, Fig. 3, ref. 203) is

utilized in combination for implementing the disk transaction (e.g. wherein the disk

transaction includes the transferring of command/data blocks) (<u>Chisholm</u>, col. 5, ll. 5-

10), therefore bypass the writing of a set of 8 bit registers in the disk controller as

implemented in ATA disk drives; in conclusion, the claimed "bypass register" would

have been suggested by <u>Chisholm</u>'s register (Fig. 3, ref. 311) and local memory

(<u>Chisholm</u>, Fig. 3, ref. 203).

4.   In responding to applicant's argument that <u>Chisholm</u> does not teach or suggest

the bridge component because <u>Chisholm</u>'s DMA controller is connected on the wrong

side of the expansion bus, as stated on page 10, last paragraph. Applicant's argument

have fully been considered, but is not found to be persuasive.

Please note that the features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features

upon which applicant relies (i.e., the locality of the bridge component) are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, the examiner relies on

Chisholm's components (Fig. 3, ref. 109, 111, 201, 203, 209, 213) for the

teaching/suggesting of the bridge component, wherein the bridge component is utilized

for connecting the peripheral (Fig. 1, ref. 114, 115) to the host side (Fig. 1, ref. 110).

I. INFORMATION CONCERNING OATH/DECLARATION

Oath/Declaration

5.   The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found

to conform to the requirements prescribed in **37 C.F.R. 1.63.**

II. INFORMATION CONCERNING DRAWINGS

Drawings

6.   The applicant's drawings submitted are acceptable for examination purposes.

III. REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chisholm et al. (US Patent 5,968,143) in view of Wood et al. (US

Patent 6,915,363) and further in view of Davis et al. (US Patent 6,298,407).

8.   As per claims 1 and 8, Chisholm teaches a bridge component for implementing

efficient disk I/O for a computer system, comprising:

a bus interface (Fig. 3, ref. 109, 111) for interfacing with a processor (Fig. 1, ref.

103) and a system memory (Fig. 3, ref. 301) of the computer system;

a disk controller (Fig. 3, ref. 201, 203, 209, 213) for executing disk transactions

for the computer system, the disk controller further comprising:

a disk I/O engine (Fig. 3, ref. 209) coupled to the bus interface; and

a device interface (Fig. 3, ref. 213) coupled to the disk I/O engine (Fig. 3, ref.

209) for interfacing the disk I/O engine with a disk drive (e.g. SCSI RAID disk drives)

(Fig. 1, ref. 114 and col. 4, ll. 26-36), the disk I/O engine further configured to execute a

disk transaction by processing the disk transaction information from a bypass register

(Fig. 3, ref. 203, 311) coupled to the disk I/O engine (col. 5, l. 1 to col. 6, l. 8), as the

command/data blocks are transferred to the bypass register for implementing disk

transaction and bypass the writing of a set of 8 bit registers in the disk controller as

implemented in ATA disk drives.

Chisholm does not teach the bridge component comprising wherein the disk I/O

engine is configured to cause a start up of the disk drive upon receiving a disk start up

command from the processor, the start up command configured to hide a start latency

of the disk drive.

Wood teaches a system and a method comprising

a host computer (Fig. 3, ref. 302);

an array of disk drives (Fig. 3, ref. 318) comprising a redundant array of

Inexpensive discs (RAID) (col. 1, ll. 47-51);

transferring a start command to the array of disk drives via a subsystem

controller (Fig. 3, ref. 314) to cause the array of disk drives to start up, as the timing for

transferring the start command to each disk drive is controlled and regulated (col. 3, ll.

10-27 and col. 6, ll. 1-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of

invention was made to include Wood's start command into Chisholm's bridge

component. The resulting combination of the references further teaches the bridge

component comprising wherein the subsystem controller (e.g. disk I/O engine) is

configured to cause the disk drive to start up as the start command (e.g. disk start up

command) is received from the host computer (e.g. processor).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wood with Chisholm for the

benefit of enabling proper start up of the array of disk drives utilizing out-of-band

signaling without exceeding the capability of the power supply (Wood, col. 1, ll. 52-60

and col. 3, ll. 1-9).

Davis teaches a bridge component comprising a number of data queues

implemented to hide the delay associated with the requesting and obtaining access to a

bus coupled to a corresponding peripheral as data can be transferred without delay (col.

1, l. 61 to col. 2, l. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of

invention was made to include Davis's data queues into Chisholm and Wood's bridge

component. The resulting combination of the references further teaches the bridge

component comprising wherein the subsystem controller (e.g. disk I/O engine) is

configured to cause the disk drive to start up as the start command (e.g. disk start up

command) is received from the host computer (e.g. processor), wherein the start

command would be configured to hide the delay associated with the disk drive's start

latency, as data to be transferred can be send following the transferring of the start

command with delay.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Davis with Chisholm and

Wood for the benefit of synchronizing the transferring of data between the initiator and

the target (Davis, col. 2, ll. 10-13).

9.   As per claims 6 and 12, <u>Chisholm</u>, <u>Wood</u> and <u>Davis</u> teaches all the limitations of

claims 1 and 8 as discussed above, where <u>Chisholm</u> further teaches the bridge

component wherein the disk controller further comprising a CPB pointer buffer

(<u>Chisholm</u>, command address queue 309 of Fig. 3) coupled to the disk I/O engine for

dynamically appending a plurality of CPB pointers (e.g. addresses pointing to where the

command block are stored) to extend to a number of disk transactions scheduled for

execution by the disk I/O engine (<u>Chisholm</u>, col. 5, l. 1 to col. 6, l. 8).

10.   As per claims 7 and 13, <u>Chisholm</u>, <u>Wood</u> and <u>Davis</u> teaches all the limitations of

claims 1 and 8 as discussed above, where <u>Chisholm</u> teaches the bridge component

wherein the disk controller further comprising a chain memory (<u>Chisholm</u>, Fig. 3, ref.

309, wherein the addresses are subsequently stored and retrieved in a chain) coupled

to the disk I/O engine for buffering a plurality of CPBs (<u>Chisholm</u>, Fig. 3, ref. 304) to

extend to a number of disk transactions scheduled for execution by the disk I/O engine

(<u>Chisholm</u>, col. 5, l. 59 to col. 6, l. 8).

IV. CLOSING COMMENTS

Conclusion

a. STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the

application as recommended by **M.P.E.P. 707.07(i)**:

a(1) CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION

Per the instant office action, claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 have received a first action

on the merits and are subject of a first action non-final.

b. DIRECTION OF FUTURE CORRESPONDENCES

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee whose telephone number is

(571) 272-0671. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM to 5PM.

IMPORTANT NOTE

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 17, 2007

DONALD SPARKS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee
Examiner
Art Unit 2181